

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-7, 9-10, and 12-16 are pending in the application. Claims 3-7, 9-10, 12 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259 to Celik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,454 to Delany et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,845,448 to Chaganti et al. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above-mentioned art and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,264 to Fisher et al. The Examiner is thanked for attention to the application.

Typographical errors are now corrected in claims 3 and 15.

Claim 3 specifies "forming a distributional list of the contacts of the user using the information regarding contacts of the user." The Office action states that Delany teaches forming a distribution list of the contacts of the user using the information regarding contacts the user, citing to col. 4, line 22 through col. 5, line 45 of Delany.

Delany et al. at col. 4, line 22 through col. 5, line 45 is a cite to most of the Summary of the Invention section of Delany et al. Delany et al. is to an electronic mail system providing improved methodology for processing messages sent to mailing lists. Delany et al., Abstract. Delany et al. discusses that upon receiving a message from a mail user agent or another message transfer agent a program stores the message temporarily locally and analyses the recipients and either delivers it or forwards it to another mail transfer agent. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 22-24. Upon receiving an e-mail message sent to a predefined mailing list, the system's mail transfer agent hands off the message with the name of the list to the system's mailing list manager. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 32-35. In Delany et al. a mailing list can be used in the recipient filed for an e-mail message, in lieu of listing individual members, so that a message sent to this distribution list goes to all recipients listed. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 41-44. Delany et al. continues with details of operation of such a system. Delany et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest "providing contact information regarding a user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified by claim 3.

That "instead of addressing an e-mail message to individual members of a recurring group, a user can instead simply to find a mailing list to comprise those members" (Delany et al., col. 4, lines 29-31) does not disclose or suggest "forming a distributional list of the contacts of the user using the information regarding contacts of the user" as specified in claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable as are dependent claims 4-7, 9-10, and 12-14.

In addition, claim 3 specifies "providing the contact information regarding the user to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user, wherein the user is a registered user and the contact information is provided to contacts of the user on the distribution list who are not registered users." The Office action indicates that Chaganti et al. teaches such, with the Office action pointing to col. 1, line 7 through col. 16, line 19 of Chaganti et al., namely more than fifteen columns of text in Chaganti et al.

As an initial matter, Chaganti et al. appears to teach away from the invention claimed in claim 3. Chaganti et al. states that "preferably, the user can also provide a list of entities that should be notified for each change. Claim 3, to the contrary, is to a method of updating personal information by using a computer, which includes forming a distributional list to the contacts of the user using the information regarding contacts of the user.

Moreover, in Chaganti et al., "the server computer 100 establishes accounts for potential requestors, allocates identifiers, authenticates their trustworthiness and enables them to establish a payment/billing plan for existing information objects stored by the user 103. Chaganti et al., col. 10, lines 32-36. Chaganti et al. also states that the server computer 100 automatically retrieves the information objects that change and notifies the designated requestor as a recipient's through secure e-mail, or other methods indicated above. Chaganti et al., col. 13, lines 10-14. With regard to secure e-mail, Chaganti et al. states, discussing on another matter "that alternatively, the requestor 105 sends a secure electronic mail (e-mail) to the server computer 100, which e-mail comprises a user identifier, a user provided authorization key or password, in

a request in the form of a database query. Chaganti et al., col. 11, lines 25-29. Chaganti et al. does not appear to otherwise discuss a secure e-mail, but from the discussion above cited it appears that secure e-mails are necessarily for requestors, who have established accounts with the server computer (Chaganti et al., col. 10, lines 32-36.). Accordingly, claim 3 is further allowable.

In addition, claim 4, dependent on claim 3, specifies "sending an e-mail to at least some of the contacts of the user in the distribution list who are not registered users". The Office action, in rejecting claim 4 cites to numerous sections of the Celik, Delany, et al., and Chaganti et al. In this regard, it is noted that claim 4 further specifies the "providing the contact information regarding the user to" portion of claim 3, something which the Office action on pgs. 4 and 5 admits are not disclosed by Celik and Delany, et al. With respect to the citation to Chaganti et al., the citation is, again, to over fifteen columns of text. However, from the above discussion of Chaganti et al. it appears that Chaganti et al. can only send us secure e-mail to a requestor, who has an account with the server computer. Accordingly, claim 4 is further allowable.

Claim 15 specifies a server configured to..."provide the contact information of the specific user to at least some of the users, who are not registered users, indicated in the contact list for the specific user automatically when the contact information for the specific user changes." In addition, claim 15 also specifies "a mass storage device coupled to the server, the mass storage device storing the contact information in the contact list for each of the plurality of users." As discussed above, it would appear that Chaganti et al. does not provide the contact information of the specific users to at least some of the users, who are not registered users, indicated in the contact list for the specific user automatically when the contact information for the specific user changes. Instead, in Chaganti et al. the user 103 elects or designates any requestors or recipients of changed notifications. The server computer 100 automatically retrieves information objects that changed and notifies the designated request as a recipient's. However, this does not appear to relate to provision of contact information to at least some users as indicated in the contact list specified in claim 15.

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date June 11, 2008
Reply to Office action of December 11, 2007

Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable, as is claim 16.

Accordingly, the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Daniel M. Cavanagh
Reg. No. 41,661
626/795-9900

DMC/rmw

RMW IRV1114398.1-*06/11/08 3:18 PM